



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

99 PAC. 310 (WASH.).—*Held*, that blasting rock in the Cascade Mountains, far removed from any human habitation, falls within the exceptions to the general rule of an employer's non-liability for injuries resulting from the doing of work placed in the hands of an independent contractor.

The weight of authority seems to hold that blasting is within the exceptions to the general rule if the employer used due care in selecting a competent contractor, *Hill v. Schneider*, 13 N. Y. App. Div. 299; *Forsyth v. Hooper*, 93 Mass. 419; and it is his legal duty to select a competent and careful contractor. *Brannock v. Elmore*, 114 Mo. 55. Furthermore, this rule applies even though the blasting is done in close proximity to adjoining buildings. *French v. Vix*, 143 N. Y. 90; *contra: Wetherbee v. Partridge*, 175 Mass. 185. But other courts hold that blasting is not within the exceptions. *Buddin v. Fortunato*, 16 Daly 195 (N. Y.); *St. Paul Water Co. v. Ware*, 16 Wall. 566 (U. S.). Yet some jurisdictions hold the principal a joint wrong-doer. *Carmen v. Steubenville, etc., Ry. Co.*, 4 Ohio St. 399.

MONEY PAID—MONEY PAID UNDER ILLEGAL CONTRACT.—*MCCALL v. WHALEY*, 115 S. W. 658 (TEX.).—*Held*, that if an illegal contract is executory, money paid thereunder may be recovered.

The law is not satisfactorily settled on this point, but generally money paid or goods delivered on an illegal executory contract can be recovered. *Love v. Harvey*, 114 Mass. 80; *Fisher v. Hildreath*, 117 Mass. 558. In such cases the law implies a promise on the part of the person receiving the money to refund it in favor of the party paying it. *Adams Express Co. v. Reno*, 48 Mo. 268. Because it best comports with public policy to arrest the illegal proceeding before it is consummated. *Stacey v. Foss*, 19 Me. 335. The following cases illustrate the rule holding that a recovery could be had for money paid on shares of stock to be illegally issued, *Fairchild v. Gallatin*, 100 U. S. 47; or for goods sold in furtherance of an illegal combination, *Continental Wall Paper Co. v. L. Vought and Sons Co.*, 77 C. C. A. 567; or for a bond or mortgage given to indemnify bail, *Moloney v. Nelson*, 158 N. Y. 351; *contra: U. S. v. Ryder*, 110 U. S. 729. But in *Ullman v. St. Louis Fair Ass'n*, 167 Mo. 273, a recovery was denied on goods delivered in performance of an illegal contract; also for money paid on a note given to renounce an executorship, *Ellicott v. Chamberlain*, 38 N. J. L. 604; and on a contract between a councilman and a municipal corporation. *Bay v. Davidson*, 133 Ia. 688. It seems, however, that a recovery will be denied on all contracts involving moral turpitude or contrary to public policy. *Edwards v. Randle*, 63 Ark. 318.

NEW TRIAL—MISCONDUCT OF COUNSEL—TREATING JURORS TO CIGARS.—*STEENBURGH v. McRORIE*, 113 N. Y. SUPP. 1118.—*Held*, that where one of the attorneys for the prevailing party twice treated the jurors to cigars during the progress of the trial and before they had retired to deliberate on their verdict, a new trial is required.

It has been well established that a new trial will be granted if jurors are entertained during the trial by the party in whose favor the